

Testimony Regarding HB 2703

Commerce, Labor and Economic Development

Doug Jorgensen, State Fire Marshal

February 19, 2020

I want to thank the committee for the opportunity to submit testimony in opposition to HB 2703. The current version of HB 2703 is confusing, and it is very hard for our agency to estimate a fiscal impact of the bill. As our agency understands the bill, all national building codes would need to be adopted in their entirety. There would also be no leeway for the state or local municipality to be less or more stringent than the national code. Currently the state does not adopt the full plumbing, electrical, HVAC codes, etc. That adoption is done at the city and county level. Our office only adopts parts of the plumbing and electrical codes that relate to the fire and life safety codes referencing sprinkler systems and fire alarm systems. Our agency also does not adopt all of the national building codes in their entirety due to parts of those codes not really applying to Kansas businesses and economy.

The national building codes usually cycle and change every 3 years. Our office and local municipalities usually adopt newer versions of the code every 6 years just due to the amount of work and time that goes into the adoption process. If the state will now need to adopt all the newest/current building codes, and taking into consideration the current state procedure on rules and regulations adoption, it would create at least 2 fulltime positions at our office and also increase the work load at the Budget Directors Office, Department of Administration, and the Attorney General's Office who all have to review any rules and regulations requests. It would also increase the workload of the legislative joint committee on rules and regulations and their staff.

The best estimate for our office, would be 2 fulltime positions with salary, benefits, and other expenses of \$217,000 annually. Our office currently has reached the limit on the available funds from the Insurance Premium Fund and these additional expenses would have to be appropriated by the legislature from state general fund dollars.

Our office feels that some of the exclusions in Section 1. (c) (1) (A)-(J) & (c)(2) conflict with Section 1. (b)(1) & (2)